



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,606	09/21/2001	Barry L. Rauworth	2267.398US03	6639

7590 03/21/2002

Patterson, Thunte, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.  
4800 IDS Center  
80 South 8th Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-2100

EXAMINER

POLLARD, STEVEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3727

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/960,606**

Applicant(s)  
**Rauworth, Et. Al.**

Examiner  
**Steven Pollard**

Art Unit  
**3727**



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 20) ☐ Other:

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3 - 6, 8 - 11, and 13 - 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutz (142).

The particular dimensions claimed would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the construction of the device of Schutz (142), motivated by the intended use. The employment of a vent valve in the vent hole of the device of Schutz (142) would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The employment of a cover over the vent valve and vent outlet would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, motivated by the wide acceptance of such in the field.

3. Claims 2, 7, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutz (142) as applied to claims 1, 3 - 6, 8 - 11, and 13 - 15 above, and further in view of Dubois, et. al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have employed the localized recess teaching set forth in Dubois, et. al. in the construction of the device of Schutz (142), producing no new and unobvious results.

4. Claims 5 and 6 - 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5, line 1: " the handle " has no proper antecedent basis.

Claim 6, line 7: " the second fitting " has no proper antecedent basis.

5. The references to Rauworth, et. al., Przytulla (049) (639), Bowers, et. al., Mikula, et. al., Hunter, et. al., Clemens, et. al., Schutz (510), Armbruster, Uhlig, Hammes, Reynolds, Pies, Nichols, Bryson, Gay, and Snyder, et. al. have been cited to further show related structure.

Steven M. Pollard

15 March 2002

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Steven M. Pollard".

**Steven Pollard**  
**Primary Examiner**